

### REMARKS

Claims 3 and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. These claims have been canceled.

Claims 1 and 3-10 have been canceled. New claim 11 further distinguishes the invention from the Corompt and Duncan references cited by the Examiner in the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejections. Claim 2 now depends on claim 11.

The Corompt reference discloses no mechanism for adjusting the extension of the jib depending on the length of the container. In addition, the Corompt reference only describes a device for handling one length of container. It does not disclose using the device for containers of different lengths, or shorter than minimum length containers, as applicant's does.

Accordingly, the purpose of the claimed invention is not taught nor suggested by the cited references, nor is there any suggestion or teaching which would lead one skilled in the relevant art to combine the references in a manner which would meet the purpose of the claimed invention. Because the cited references, whether considered alone, or in combination with one another, do not teach nor suggest the purpose of the claimed invention, Applicant respectfully submits that the claimed invention, as amended, patentably distinguishes over the prior art, including the art cited merely of record.

Based on the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that its claims 1-78, as amended, are in condition for allowance at this time, patentably distinguishing over the cited prior art. Accordingly, reconsideration of the application and passage to allowance are respectfully solicited.

The Examiner is respectfully urged to call the undersigned attorney at (515) 288-2500 to discuss the claims in an effort to reach a mutual agreement with respect to claim limitations in the present application which will be effective to define the patentable subject matter if the present claims are not deemed to be adequate for this purpose.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 9/5/06

Emily Harris